DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 407 RC 004 653

TITLE	Human Resources in the Ozarks Region...With Emphasis on the Poor.
INSTITUTION	Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, Fayetteville.; Missouri Univ., Columbia. Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Economic Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.; Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	AER-182
PUB DATE	May 70
NOTE	56p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	American Indians, Anglo Americans, *Cross Cultural Studies, *Disadvantaged Groups, *Economically Disadvantaged, *Economic Research, Education, Employment, Human Resources, Negroes, *Rural Areas
IDENTIFIERS	*Ozarks Region

ABSTRACT

The report is on the socioeconomic condition of rural people within a selected area in the United States. The information was provided by 1,413 sample households in the rural areas of 125 counties in the Ozarks region of Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. The study included Whites, Indians, and Negroes within the region. Based on household size and income in 1965, 25% of the households were considered seriously deprived. Based on income alone, 44% were considered deprived, having earned less than $3,000. The people studied were grouped into 5 classes based on household size and income: (1) seriously deprived, (2) deprived, (3) marginal, (4) probably not deprived, and (5) definitely not deprived. The major characteristics associated with deprivation included advanced age, being the female head of a household, low levels of education, marginal farming, and physical disabilities. Sixty percent of the people with children at home stated that, in their judgement, their children would need to finish college. Because most household incomes are so low, a major tragedy in the Ozarks region may be the financial inability to support youngsters in reaching desired educational levels. (EJ)

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIC REPORT NO. 182

HUMAN RESOURCES IN THE OZARKS REGION...

WITH EMPHASIS ON THE POOR

RECEIVED
OCT 8 1970
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

ED043407
RC004653

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.



ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE
IN COOPERATION WITH THE UNIVERSITIES OF ARKANSAS
AND MISSOURI AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ED043407

ABSTRACT

This report is one in a series on the socioeconomic condition of rural people within selected areas of the United States. The rural parts of the Ozarks region of Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma comprise the study area for this report, and 1,413 sample household heads provided information. Of these households, 25 percent were found to be economically deprived or seriously deprived. Another 28 percent were classified as marginal. Thus, current public and private efforts to improve economic welfare of Ozarks residents seems warranted on the basis of these data. However, efforts to improve income through rural industrialization may not be fully effective because advanced age is a fact for one-third to one-half of the household heads. These persons are at a disadvantage compared with younger in-migrants, for example, in competing for new jobs. Other disadvantages found in the region were that most deprived families had at least two clearly poverty-linked characteristics: advanced age, female head of household, low educational attainment, farm residence, and physical disabilities. Having any one of these characteristics tended to make a family deprived, and the more of them a family had, the more deprived it was.

Key Words: Poverty, human resources, income, education, employment, Ozarks region, rural areas, tabular analysis, primary survey, cross-sectional.

PREFACE

This report is one in a series on conditions of poverty among rural people within selected areas of the United States. Study areas for these reports include the Ozarks, the Mississippi Delta, and the Coastal Plain of South Carolina.*

A previous report on the Ozarks region examined rural housing conditions.** Other topics that will receive special attention include migration, education, health, social participation and attitudes, and agriculture. This second report presents findings on the interrelationships between family income, age, education, training, employment, aspirations, and other attributes of the rural population.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was made possible through a cooperative arrangement with the Office of Economic Opportunity. Dr. Rex Campbell, Associate Professor of Rural Sociology, University of Missouri, shared the planning and field work in this study. Mrs. Jean Everling, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Missouri, bore the major burden of supervising the field work phase. Max F. Jordan and Melvin R. Janssen, Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, provided valuable assistance in the planning and preparation of this report.

RECEIVED OCT 8 1970 NMSU E.R.I.C.

---

* Characteristics of Human Resources in the Southeastern Coastal Plain . . . With Emphasis on the Poor, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Econ. Rpt. 155, Apr. 1969.

** Hughes H. Spurlock, Rural Housing Conditions in the Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma Ozarks, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr. cooperating with the Agr. Exper. Station, Univ. of Ark., Bul. 736, Dec. 1968.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402

CONTENTS

	Page
HIGHLIGHTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
STUDY AREA	2
SAMPLING PROCEDURE	4
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS	
Place of Residence by Number in Household, Age, and Race	4
Household Income by Sex, Source, Number in Household, and Race	6
INCOME AND NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD AS INDICATORS OF RELATIVE ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION	
A Better Measure of Relative Need	7
Characteristics of Economically Deprived Households	8
Dependency	9
Sex	9
Age	10
Education	10
OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS	
Household Income by Employment Status and Occupation	11
Education by Employment Status and Occupation	12
Household Size-Income Class by Occupation	12
Residence by Number of Income Earners and Incidence of Multiple Employment	12
Age of Head by Number of Jobs in Previous 5 Years and by Unemployment	13
AGRICULTURE	14
PHYSICAL CAPABILITY LEVEL OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS	15
EDUCATION OF CHILDREN	16
A PROFILE OF ECONOMICALLY DEPRIVED HOUSEHOLDS	18
TABLES	21

Washington, D.C. 20250 May 1970

HIGHLIGHTS

Of 1,413 sample households in the rural Ozarks region, 25 percent are deprived or seriously deprived. This estimate is based on household size and income in 1965. Based on income alone, 44 percent are deprived, having earned less than $3,000 in 1965. Per capita income of the entire region was $1,233 in 1959.

To obtain a better measure of deprivation than that provided by income alone, persons studied were arrayed in five classes of relative need, based on household size and 1965 income. The classes were labeled seriously deprived, deprived, marginal, probably not deprived, and definitely not deprived. In addition to the 25 percent in the two deprived classes, 28 percent were marginal. Forty-seven percent were in the remaining classes.

Even in such a low-income region as the Ozarks, poverty is thought to be borne more heavily by groups whose characteristics in terms of age, sex, race, education, residence, or disability, can be called poverty-linked.

Advanced age as a poverty-linked characteristic of rural Ozarks residents deserves special attention. More than half of the heads of households studied were 55 and over; 34 percent were 65 and over. Income deprivation was associated directly with age despite social security and other programs designed to meet the needs of the elderly. In fact, 51 percent of the 353 household heads classified as seriously deprived or deprived were 65 and over. It will be most difficult to help this large proportion of rural Ozarks families to achieve satisfactory incomes except through income transfers from welfare or retirement programs. The problem of advanced age is intensified by the related problems of lower level of education, greater medical costs, higher rate of disability, and lower earning ability, especially among elderly female heads of households.

Regardless of age, female heads of households generally suffer from low incomes. Seventeen percent of the 1,413 heads of households were female; and 82 percent of them had incomes under $3,000 in 1965, compared with 35 percent of the males. One-fourth of all households with female heads had incomes under $1,000. Eighty percent of the female heads were in the lower three deprivation classes, compared with 49 percent of the males.

The economic plight of races other than the white living in the Ozarks region is also serious. The two groups studied (4.6 percent of the sample households) were Negroes in Arkansas and Indians in Oklahoma. Sixty-four percent of these groups had household incomes of less than $3,000 in 1965, compared with 43 percent of the whites. Fifteen percent received less than $1,000, compared with 7 percent of the white households.

The relatively low level of formal education among Ozarks breadwinners is another serious problem. Thirteen percent of the sample heads of

households had less than 5 years of education, and 58 percent had 8 years or less. Of those with 8 years or less, 35 percent were in deprivation classes 1 and 2, compared with 9 percent of those who had completed high school. The elderly, who are near or in retirement, had the least education. And as noted earlier, 51 percent of those in the two deprived classes were 65 or over.

Twenty-one percent of the sample households were classified as rural farm, 79 percent as rural nonfarm. Thirty-seven percent of the farmers received less than $1,000 gross farm income in 1965, and another 29 percent received only $1,000 to $2,499. Generally, the low level of gross farm income made other sources of income essential.

Nearly a fourth of the sample's household heads said they considered themselves to be partially disabled. Another 7 percent indicated total disability. Forty-one percent of the disabled were in the two deprived classes. Two-thirds of the disabled household heads received less than $3,000 in 1965. Fourteen percent of those reporting partial disability received incomes under $1,000 in 1965.

Education and training are generally thought to increase one's employability, thus permitting those who can work to escape economic deprivation. Heads of households in this study perceive a need for a high level of educational achievement by their children. Sixty percent of those with children at home stated that, in their judgment, their children would need to finish college, and 53 percent of those with at least one son in school expected the oldest son to finish college. Because most household incomes are so low, a major tragedy in the Ozarks region may be the financial inability to support youngsters in reaching desired educational levels. Also, limited regional resources may jeopardize the general provision of high quality educational facilities and programs.

Based on data in this report, the national concern for economic deprivation in the Ozarks region seems justified. The magnitude of the needed remedial effort is indicated generally by the fact that one-fourth of the households are categorized as economically deprived. The alternative forms that remedial efforts might take are suggested by the major characteristics associated with deprivation. These include advanced age, being the female head of a household, low levels of education, marginal farming, and physical disabilities. Also, races other than white, though a small minority in the Ozarks, have severe problems. Finally, after decades of adjustment, including selective outmigration and absolute population decreases, more than one of these poverty-linked characteristics frequently converge on any given household. Thus, the plight of the households categorized as seriously deprived (5 percent) may require a flexible set of remedial programs.

HUMAN RESOURCES IN THE OZARKS REGION
. . . WITH EMPHASIS ON THE POOR

By

Herbert Hoover and Bernal L. Green 1/

INTRODUCTION

Many social scientists support the view that during times of national prosperity, economic deprivation is still the lot of "special" groups. Many rural people are among these groups. Some policy makers have stated that economic and social deprivation is more properly and effectively attacked by specific programs that improve the income and living conditions of such groups rather than by general programs which aid only agricultural production units. 2/ If this point of view prevails, attention will shift from the farm as a producing unit to consideration of the condition of certain groups as consumers. This shift in emphasis would be due to the belated recognition that efficiency in agriculture can improve economic conditions of only a small proportion of people in a region. Capital has substituted for a large amount of farm labor and too many of the released laborers have been unable even to maintain already inadequate incomes. Low incomes have become a way of life for many inhabitants of the largely rural Ozarks region. 3/ They have long had to make substantial physical and human resource adjustment.

Changes in the economic structure of agriculture at the national level and the dominance of major labor markets in a few urban centers in the United States have combined to cause a net outmigration from the Ozarks of nearly half a million people in the 1950 decade alone. 4/ The population was 2.6 million in 1950. Unfortunately, the ones who left tended to be new labor

---

1/ Agricultural Economists, Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, stationed at the Universities of Missouri and Arkansas, respectively. This study is in cooperation with the Agricultural Experiment Stations of both Universities.

2/ For a detailed discussion, see: Oscar Ornati, "Poverty in America," Poverty in America, Book of Readings edited by Louis A. Ferman, et al., Ann Arbor: Univ. of Mich. Press, 1966, pp. 26-27.

3/ In 52 of the 125 counties comprising the region, 100 percent of the families were classified rural by the 1960 Population Census.

4/ Bernal L. Green, "Migration Patterns of Ozarks Region Compared with Adjacent Areas," The Arkansas Agricultural Economist, Univ. of Ark., Vol. 9, No. 2, Mar. 1967.

force entrants with the best skills and most years of productive work life ahead, leaving the region with a higher proportion of older persons of retirement age. This shift to an older population, plus the low per capita income of Ozarks residents ($1,233, which in 1959 was even lower than that of residents in the more publicized Appalachian region, $1,451) suggests that the changes in the region have had some unfavorable impacts on its remaining inhabitants. 5/ Thus, the well-being of people in the Ozarks has become of increasing concern to leaders in the region and Nation. The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is a significant manifestation of this concern. 6/ The Ozarks region was delineated under provisions of the Act. The Ozarks Regional Development Commission, a Federal-State body, is coordinating efforts to improve the Ozarks economy.

While the broad problem is clear, it has so many facets that one cannot readily recommend policies and programs for the groups in serious need. The study reported on here was conducted to learn about the characteristics and problems of the people and to enable concerned persons to determine more effective means of handling these problems.

STUDY AREA

The rural parts of the 125 counties in the Ozarks region constitute the study area (fig. 1). 7/ The term rural includes households located on farms, in open country, and in towns with up to 2,500 population. In 1960, there were an estimated 780,415 occupied dwelling units in the region. Seventeen percent were classified as farm, 41 percent as rural nonfarm, and 42 percent, urban. 8/ Thus, the rural parts accounted for, at the most, 58 percent of occupied dwelling units. The actual percentage at the time of the study in 1966 was probably closer to 50 percent. In 1960, the urban parts of the region consisted of 67 cities with populations between 2,500 and 9,999, 16 cities between 10,000 and 24,999, and only seven cities with populations of 25,000 and over. The largest cities were Little Rock, Ark. (population 108,000), Springfield, Mo. (96,000), and Muskogee, Okla. (38,000). 9/

5/ Max F. Jordan and Lloyd D. Bender, An Economic Survey of the Ozark Region, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr. cooperating with the Agr. Exper. Station, Univ. of Ark., Agr. Econ. Rpt. No. 97, 1966, p. 12.

6/ Public Law 89-136, 89th Cong., S. 1648, Aug. 26, 1965.

7/ Nine counties in Southeast Kansas became a part of the region after the field interviews were completed. Thus, the Kansas counties were not included in the study.

8/ United States Census of Housing, 1960, State and Small Areas, Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, Bur. of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, HC (1) Nos. 5, 25, and 38.

9/ United States Census of Population, 1960, Number of Inhabitants, Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, Bur. of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, PC (1) 5A, 27A, and 38A.

OZARKS

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REGION, 1966



The region is comprised of four broad physiographic areas: (1) The Ozark Uplands in the northern part, (2) the Arkansas River Valley in the center, (3) the Ouachita Mountains in the southern part, and (4) border counties consisting of coastal plain, prairie, bottomland, and bottomland terrace. Agricultural activity is mainly beef cattle (cow-calf enterprises) and poultry production, and dairying. Manufacturing is predominantly a slow-growth industry and is not expanding fast enough to absorb persons released from agriculture. 10/

SAMPLING PROCEDURE

A stratified block sampling procedure was used to select 1,500 households. First, 27 counties were randomly selected to represent portions of the area. In each of these counties, four townships were randomly selected to reduce travel time and distance for interviewers. Sampling blocks were then drawn to determine households to be interviewed. The schedules were allocated in proportion to the population of each sampling area. The selection of counties also gave representation of various income levels.

The preenumeration estimate of the number of rural households in the region was 451,000; thus, the predetermined sample of 1,500 households yielded a sampling rate of 0.33 percent. Expanding the data to totals for the rural parts of the region may be useful. This can be done by using the expansion factor 300.67.

Since the estimates are based on sample data, they are subject to sampling variability. They may differ somewhat from the results that would have been obtained from another sample or from a complete census of the region that used the same questionnaire, instructions, and interviewers. However, selected comparisons with data available for the region have shown that the sample is large enough to be adequate.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS

Place of Residence by Number in Household, Age, and Race

All households enumerated in this study were in the rural parts of the Ozarks region. Most of them (79 percent) were classified as rural nonfarm. The remaining households (21 percent) were classified as farm (tables 1 and 2). The average of slightly more than 3 persons per household was less than

10/ Jordan and Bender, op. cit., pp. 26, 55.

the 1960 national average of 3.4 for all households. 11/ However, the number of retirees, which is indicated by the one- and two-member households, has been increasing steadily in the region. Most one-member households--198 of 209--were nonfarm and most of these people were elderly. A high proportion of them lived in or near small towns, which would suggest that the isolation of open-country residence is a consideration of elderly persons who live alone.

Ten percent of the farm households had six or more members, which indicates that, in most of these households, four children probably are present. Thus, many young household members are subject to the effects of low farm incomes.

Age is one of several interrelated variables essential in describing the people of a region and in evaluating alternative strategies to reduce poverty. For example, economists considering the allocation of scarce resources among competing ends will tend to invest resources to return the highest yields. Thus, they can make a stronger case for investment in young people, particularly heads of households, who expect many years of productive work, than for similar investment in older persons who will soon be retiring. A region characterized by older household heads and a low density and spatial dispersion of population that is young has difficult problems. Such is the case in the Ozarks region. The median age of sample heads of households was 55 years (table 3). This fact suggests that the cost of efforts to provide marketable skills could be amortized over no more than 10 years for half the household heads. Also, one-third of household heads were 65 and older. Twelve percent were 75 and over; most of these people were rural nonfarm. Yet, persons between 55 and 62 are not eligible for retirement payments in the Social Security program. For those who do eventually qualify, such payments will tend to be near the minimum allowed. A further problem is that economic criteria will place training and retraining emphasis more on the younger household heads than on those approaching retirement. However, other criteria may warrant investment in persons in the upper age ranges.

Heads of farm households had the same median age as their nonfarm counterparts, but the distribution of ages of farm heads was more concentrated. Nearly 70 percent of the farmers were 45 to 74 years of age, compared with 54 percent of the rural nonfarmers.

Race is another characteristic of importance in describing the inhabitants of a region. Decades of discrimination against minority groups leaves a legacy of extremely low incomes, low skill and educational attainments, high rates of unemployment and underemployment, and social disorganization. In regard to economic losses that tend to result, Tang observes that race discrimination in public education had relatively little effect on productivity in traditional agriculture. But such discrimination

---

11/ Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1967, Bur. of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, 88th edit., p. 36.

may have an important influence in developed economies where decisionmaking becomes complex even in agriculture. 12/

Negroes and American Indians constitute the main minority groups in the Ozarks region. In 1960, 6.7 percent of all families in the region were classified as races other than white, with 9.9 percent in the urban areas and 5.9 percent in the rural areas. 13/ Main concentrations were in Pulaski County, Ark. (8,916, primarily Negroes), and in McCurtain County, Okla. (4,840, primarily Indians). In this study, 65 households (4.6 percent of the sample) were other races, with all but three of the 65 being classified as rural nonfarm (table 4). Thus, the low proportion of races other than white constitutes a major difference between residents in the Ozarks region and some other low-income regions.

Household Income by Sex, Source, Number in Household, and Race

The word "poverty" has many dimensions; it means different things to different people. To most people, the poor are those whose basic physical and social needs exceed their means to satisfy those needs--in other words, those who lack disposable income, the chief indicator of their ability to meet such needs. A figure used to express the minimum that a family needs is $3,000 per year. Even after considerable refinement, this definition has some appeal because of its simplicity.

On the basis of the $3,000-per-year figure, households in the rural Ozarks are indeed economically deprived. Forty-four percent of the sample households had net incomes under $3,000 in 1965 (table 5). It is risky to use income for a single year for analysis, but the high percentage of low incomes during a year in which the national economy experienced a high level of sustained growth is an indicator of a serious poverty problem in the Ozarks. The complexity of the problem is increased by the high proportion of households headed by females. Eighty-two percent of the households with female heads had incomes less than $3,000. These comprised nearly one-third of all households with incomes less than $3,000.

Source of income is the next characteristic considered here. Farmers in the Ozarks must work with "soils which are generally characterized by low fertility, rough topography, stoniness, and poor moisture-holding capacity." 14/ Thus, their income-earning ability is limited. Because these soil conditions also limit their ability to adopt new technology to increase their

---

12/ Anthony M. Tang, "Economic Development and Changing Consequences of Race Discrimination in Southern Agriculture," Journal of Farm Economics, Vol. XLI, No. 5, Dec. 1959, pp. 1,113-121, 126.

13/ U.S. Census of Population, 1960, Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, General Population Characteristics, Bur. of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, PC (1), 5B, 27B, and 38B.

14/ Jordan and Bender, op. cit., p. 18.

earnings, many farmers must seek off-farm employment. In 1959, 40 percent of all farm operators in the region worked 100 days or more off the farm, compared with 30 percent at the national level. 15/ Also, 54 percent of all farmers in the region had off-farm income greater than the value of their farm products sales, compared with 36 percent at the national level. 16/ Excluding the 18 farmers in this study who had incomes of $10,000 and over, 51 percent had some income (wages and salaries) from off-farm work (table 6). This proportion might have been higher if off-farm job opportunities had been more plentiful. Only 53 percent of the nonfarm heads in this study received income from wages and salaries. This low proportion reflects the relatively large number who are retired.

Household income by number in the household and by race is another factor for consideration. Most people would agree that the family income necessary for a given level of well-being for each person in a household is not a linear function of the number in the household. For example, a family of four may meet its needs with an annual income of $1,000 per person, but this is generally considered too low for one- and two-member households. Thus, the distribution of income by number of household members can provide insight into degrees of poverty. Data in table 7 show that 28 percent of the single-member households had incomes under $1,000 in 1965, and an additional 52 percent had less than $2,000. Obviously, some basic needs must have gone unmet in most of these households. Even more serious is the plight of households with six or more members and incomes below $2,000. Percentages of households in this income group ranged from 5 percent of those with nine or more members, to 23 percent of those households with eight members (table 7).

Household income data in table 7 are separated by race of household heads in tables 8 and 9. The economic plight of races other than white is illustrated by the finding that of the 65 such households in the sample, 81 percent of the single-member households and 50 percent of the two-member households had incomes under $2,000 in 1965 (table 9). In contrast, only 30 percent of the two-member white households had incomes that low.

INCOME AND NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD AS INDICATORS OF RELATIVE ECONOMIC DEPRIVATION

A Better Measure of Relative Need

Use of the figure $3,000 to indicate a poverty level of income, as with any other specified amount, is arbitrary. Such a selection fails to distinguish between factors that determine family need and that sometimes

15/ U.S. Census of Agriculture, 1959, Arkansas Counties, and United States, General Report, Bur. of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, Wash., D.C., Vol. I Part 34, and Vol. II.

16/ Ibid.

intensify or mitigate it. Such factors include size of family, age of members, and family assets and liabilities.

The stages in the normal evolution of the family cycle, for example, create vastly different situations concerning need. Income requirements of newly married couples are less than those of families with young dependent children. Families with only preschool children may need less income than those with older children who require increasing expenditures for food, clothing, school, and social activities. Although income requirements of older families whose children have left home would be expected to decline, advancing age may bring increasing expenses for medical care. However, older families frequently enjoy mitigating circumstances that cannot be measured by income alone. Many of these families may be living on accumulated savings; they may own their homes and have other investment capital; their needs for food, clothing, and social activities may also be less.

Five categories of relative need based on household income and size were developed to obtain a better measure of need than that provided by household income alone (table 10). The categories were developed to coordinate research efforts among areas and provide interregional comparisons. Estimates by Orshansky of minimum income needs for families by size of family were used as a guide in making these groupings. 17/ The range in incomes does not permit precision in the goupings, but the categories are an improvement over simple groupings by income.

Five percent of the sample households were classified as seriously deprived (class 1), and twenty percent were classified as deprived (table 11). Thus, income deprivation was a problem in at least one out of four households in the study area. Also, a large proportion (28 percent) of the survey families were in the marginal category. With a slight reduction in income or increase in household membership, these marginal families could become deprived.

Characteristics of Economically Deprived Households

Ratios based on dependency, sex, and fertility are commonly used to illustrate important changes occurring to people at selected times and places.

Note: The section A Better Measure of Relative Need is largely taken from Jackson V. McElveen, Characteristics of Human Resources in the Rural Southeast Coastal Plain . . . with Emphasis on the Poor, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Agr. Econ. Rpt. 155, Apr. 1969, pp. 15-16.

17/ Mollie Orshansky, Social Security Bulletins, Jan. and July, 1965. Some families that could not be classified in the five deprivation groups were included in a separate class 6, other. Other geographic areas studied are identified in the Preface.

Dependency

The dependency ratio in 1960 for people in the entire Ozarks region was 1.20, compared with 1.30 for the United States. 18/ These ratios are based on the number of persons either under 14 or 65 and over, divided by the number of persons aged 20 through 64. Children 14 and under are considered too young to work effectively, and persons aged 65 and older are considered to be of retirement age. In this study, the dependency ratio was 1.04 and 1.52 for households in deprivation classes 1 and 2, respectively (table 12). The top row of numbers in table 12 illustrates the inverse relationship between dependency and economic capability to meet the responsibilities of dependency. The dependency ratios for white households are presented in table 13. Dependency ratios for households of other races were substantially higher than those for white households except in deprivation class 2 (table 14).

Sex

Sex ratio indicates population composition of an area and relative earning capacity. The ratio is based on heads of households and their spouses, and excludes children and other household members. It is computed by dividing the number of males by the number of females. For races other than white, all the sex ratios were less than 1 except for deprivation class 5 (table 14). Because so many household heads were in the upper age ranges, the low sex ratios probably show the tendency of females to outlive males. The ratios could also reflect a higher migration rate for males.

Fertility ratio is the last variable entered in tables 12 through 14. It is defined here as the number of children under 5 years of age divided by the number of women in the age range 15-44. For whites, the ratios were highest for the two deprived classes and the marginal class. For other races, classes 1 (seriously deprived), 3 (marginal), and 4 (probably not deprived) had the highest fertility ratios. Households of other races had higher fertility ratios than households of whites except in class 2 (tables 13 and 14).

Sex of household heads is commonly believed to be a poverty-linked characteristic. 19/ Data in table 15 support this hypothesis. While the proportion of males and females in deprivation class 1 was similar, the difference was marked in the remaining classes. For example, deprivation class 2 contained 33 percent of the 242 female heads of households, compared with 18 percent of the 1,171 male heads. Eighty percent of the female heads of households were in the lower three classes, compared with 49 percent of the males.

18/ United States Census of Population, 1960, General Population Characteristics, Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, Bur. of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, PC (1), 1B, 5B, 27B, and 38B.

19/ Oscar Ornati, op. cit.

Age

The influence of age on economic deprivation is affected by changing physical stamina, even for those in predominantly mental pursuits, and by regulations set by society, such as mandatory retirement, varying among employers, from ages 65 to 70. Since the rural parts of the Ozarks region are characterized by a generally older population, the adequacy of retirement benefits becomes of major concern. Average monthly social security payments in 1965 of only $142 to retired workers' families in the United States heightens the concern. 20/ Data in the middle section of table 16 for the sample households show that the percentage of households in the two deprived classes increased with age of household head. For example, 13 percent of households in these classes (2 percent in class 1 and 11 percent in class 2) were headed by persons under 25, 17 percent by persons age 45-54, and 44 percent by persons 75 and over. Also, the percentage of households in the marginal category (class 3) increased sharply beginning with the 45-54 age range for household heads. Thus, for rural Ozarks residents, income deprivation was associated directly with age despite social security and other programs designed for the needs of older people.

Education

Education is a vital ingredient in the successful functioning of all societies. It is thus a persistent social concern. Failure to educate people and to provide opportunities for them to use their education and training can cause a profound change in the nature of society. 21/ In a country like the United States, where occupations requiring the highest levels of education and training are increasing rapidly, differences in income among occupations and educational levels are discernible. For example, Bird, using different criteria, noted that in 1959 the incidence of poverty was 31 percent among rural farm families whose heads had 12 years of school, but 57 percent among families where the head had 8 or less years of school. 22/ In the present study, 35 percent (287 of 813 households) of the rural households whose heads had 8 years or less of school were in the two deprived classes, and an additional 34 percent were in the marginal category (table 17). A much lower proportion (9 percent) of families headed by persons with 12 years of school were in the two deprived classes. However, 20 percent were in the marginal category. Nine percent of the household heads had 1 or more years of college. Most of these were in the top household size-income classes.

20/ "Old-Age, Survivors, Disability, and Health Insurance for Worker and Wife, Aged 62 and Over," Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1967, Bur. of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, 88th ed., p. 292.

21/ John F. Cuber, Sociology, A Synopsis of Principles, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1947, p. 468.

22/ Alan R. Bird, Poverty in Rural Areas of the United States, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Wash., D.C., Agr. Econ. Rpt. No. 63, Nov. 1964, p. 18.

Data in table 18 illustrate the inverse relationship between age and education. For example, 92 percent of the household heads aged 25-34 had completed eight grades or more; thus, only 8 percent completed less than eight grades. For the group aged 65-74, only 58 percent had completed eight grades or more.

OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE HOUSEHOLDS

The elderly now have increasing geographic mobility as a result of private pension and social security systems. The exercise of this mobility can easily be observed in the Ozarks region in the form of retirement communities. The upper White River basin's pleasant four-season climate with short mild winters and cool dry summers is a strong attraction for in-migrating retirees throughout a 600-mile radius. 23/ Thus, one would expect to find that a large proportion of rural heads of households presently residing in the Ozarks are not in the labor force.

Household Income by Employment Status and Occupation

The above expectation is supported by data in table 19 showing 39 percent of heads of households not in the labor force. Of the 545 heads not in the labor force, 255 were retired, 186 were housewives, 71 were disabled, 30 were both retired and disabled, and three were enrolled in school.

Of these 545 heads, 56 percent reported incomes under $2,000, contrasted with only about 10 percent of the 826 employed heads of households.

The unemployment rate was only 4.4 percent, but this rate, of course, does not reflect the prevalent underemployment in the region.

Among the occupational groups represented, those jobs requiring the highest levels of education and skills provided the highest incomes (table 20). Only 3 percent of the 60 heads classified as professional, technical, and kindred workers had incomes under $3,000. Of the white-collar groups, the largest proportion (18 percent) of workers with incomes under $3,000 were those classified as clerical and kindred. Respondents classified as farmers, farm managers, and farm laborers had disproportionately large numbers in the lower income ranges. Two-fifths of the 198 persons in this category had incomes less than $3,000.

23/ Richmond C. Johnson, Proposal: A New Community in the Ozarks, Forsyth, Mo., Dec. 1964, p. 81.

Education by Employment Status and Occupation

The relationship between employment status and education of household heads is presented in table 21. The typical head of household in the sample had a low level of formal education. Approximately three-fifths of the 1,413 household heads studied had completed eight grades or less. Of the 868 household heads in the labor force, only 7 percent had 4 years or less of education, compared with 23 percent of those not in the labor force.

The white-collar workers (professional, managerial, clerical, and sales) had considerably more years of education than the other occupational groups (table 22). Nearly two-thirds of the white-collar workers had completed 12 or more years of formal education, compared with 30 percent of blue-collar workers (craftsmen, foremen, and operatives), 35 percent of service workers, and 23 percent of farmers and farm laborers. Only 11 percent of the household heads not in the labor force had received a similar amount of education. Most of these heads were retired or were housewives. This low level of formal education for many of the heads of households in the Ozarks region depressed the level of income.

Household Size-Income Class by Occupation

The occupation of sample heads of households by level of economic deprivation is presented in table 23. Similar to the finding in table 20 that few white collar workers had incomes under $3,000 was the finding in table 23 that few of these workers were in the deprived categories 1 and 2. Clerical and kindred workers had the largest proportion in these categories, with 11 percent. Half the farm laborers were in the two deprived categories, as were 28 percent of the farmers and farm managers.

Residence by Number of Income Earners and Incidence of Multiple Employment

The number of income earners in a household is related to the employment and income-earning opportunities available to the household members. Because of the limited earning opportunities on farms and the expanding employment opportunities in job markets accessible to farm residents, increasing numbers of farm family members are seeking off-farm employment, and more family heads than before are seeking multiple employment. For the sample households, data show a slight difference between farm and nonfarm residence in number of income earners per household (table 24). Fifty-four percent of the farmers and 56 percent of the nonfarmers had one income earner, while 40 percent and 38 percent, respectively, had two income earners. The second income earners are probably female workers finding employment in slow-growth manufacturing industries producing such items as apparel and food products. As reported in another study, the total labor force in the Ozarks declined 5 percent in

1950-60, but the female labor force increased 28 percent. 24/ Of the 827 employed household heads in this study, 129 (16 percent) had multiple employment (table 25). Forty percent of the farmers and only 5 percent of the nonfarmers had multiple employment, which indicates a strong farmer incentive for "moonlighting."

Age of Head by Number of Jobs in Previous 5 Years and by Unemployment

The number of different jobs held in the last 5 years can indicate (1) vertical mobility--the individual's ability to get higher paying jobs, (2) horizontal mobility--the individual's ability, when he wishes to change jobs, to get and keep a regular job, or (3) stability of employment (if he has held only one job). Because the number of jobs held can indicate one or more of the types of occupational mobility, other indicators--such as education, occupation, and income of the individual--should be considered in determining the extent and kind of the individual's occupational mobility. Table 26 shows that 37 percent of the 1,057 heads of households in the labor force during 1961-65 held only one job. Another 37 percent had held two different jobs. Higher proportions of heads of households in the upper age ranges, except those heads beyond retirement age, had held only one job. This is in contrast with higher proportions of the younger groups who had held two or more jobs. In general, the younger heads had more job mobility than the older ones. For example, the heads under 25 years of age held an average of 3.7 jobs during 1961-65, compared with 1.8 jobs for those aged 55-64.

A companion study based on the same 1,413 households concluded that (1) the household heads had horizontal occupational mobility, (2) the majority of the heads in the sample did not exhibit vertical occupational mobility, (3) the main occupation that the head's father pursued did not determine the present occupation of the head, and (4) for the sample households, socioeconomic class placed a ceiling on both educational attainment and aspirations. 25/

Of the 868 heads in the labor force at the time of the interviews, 810 said they had had no periods of unemployment of 2 weeks or longer during the previous 5 years (table 27). However, 21 of the 55 heads who had experienced unemployment had been unemployed for 6 months or longer (table 28).

Of the 640 household heads reporting hours worked, half worked 21-40 hours a week (table 29). An additional 16 percent worked 60 hours or more a week.

24/ Jordan and Bender, op. cit., p. 59.

25/ Betty Kaplan, "Occupational Mobility in the Ozarks Region," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Rural Sociology, Univ. of Mo., 1968.

AGRICULTURE

Farm families in the Ozarks region have long faced agricultural adjustment problems stemming from forces beyond their control. As stated in the introduction of this report, many thousands have migrated even though they were not prepared to make the change. Most social scientists and teachers who know the Ozarks think that the cumulative investment made in the migrants as human resources has been much too small to enable them to qualify for the more skilled types of employment that are available today. 26/ Many people now recognize the importance of solving the problems of farm families remaining in the Ozarks to lessen the severity of urban problems. Several urban problems have developed primarily because the rate of inmigration of rural people has been greater than the capacity of urban areas to meet the needs of these people sufficiently. Since the income-producing ability of the region will be a major factor determining the number of people who leave, this study briefly examined the farm sector to determine how extensive future farm adjustments are likely to be.

Respondents indicated that beef cattle production (primarily cow-calf operations) was the major source of farm income in the Ozarks (table 30). The proportion giving this source increased slightly from 58 percent in the low-income county stratum to 62 percent in the high-income stratum. The increase was larger for dairy enterprises (from 11 percent to 19 percent, respectively). Dairy farms are usually located near population centers, and residents of counties with such centers tend to have higher incomes. Except for miscellaneous and unclassified farms, livestock farms were the most numerous, with 21 percent of total farms in the region. 27/ This figure excludes poultry and dairy farms. Dairy farms were second with 11 percent, followed by farms producing field crops (other than fruits, vegetables, and nuts) with 7 percent.

Most of the sample Ozarks farmers (85 percent) owned their farms (table 31). Only 9 percent were renters. Sharecropping, which is fairly common in adjacent specialized agricultural areas, is uncommon in the Ozarks.

Gross farm returns were low (table 32). Thirty-seven percent of the farmers received less than $1,000 in farm income during 1965. In general, the distribution of farm incomes indicated that income deficiencies were so serious that nonfarm employment would be essential in most cases.

While home food production was frequently reported in Ozark households, one out of three farm households and about three out of 10 deprived farm

---

26/ Lee R. Martin, "Alternative Uses for Resources Displaced by Agricultural Adjustments," Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, Supplement, Vol. 41, Dec. 1960.

27/ U.S. Census of Agriculture, 1959, Arkansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma Counties, Bur. of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, Vol. I, Parts 34, 17, and 36.

households produced no meat for home use (table 33). Almost all deprived farm families (94 percent) reported growing a garden. However, the share of the family's total meat and vegetable needs met from home production was not determined.

PHYSICAL CAPABILITY LEVEL OF HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

A general awareness has existed for a long time that medical services for rural people are chronically insufficient. If this insufficiency exists at the State or regional level over a long period, an unusually large number of people would have untreated chronic illness or physical disabilities. The problem is made more complex if the scarcity of medical services occurs in conjunction with income deprivation, advanced age, and isolated living. The physician-population ratio is one gross indicator of medical sufficiency in a State. Of the 48 contiguous states, Arkansas ranked 47th in 1965 with a physician-population ratio of only 67 per 100,000 population. Alabama and South Carolina had the lowest ratio of 62. Oklahoma and Missouri ranked 23rd and 14th with ratios of 89 and 97 per 100,000, respectively. 28/

Nearly a fourth of the household heads in this study stated that they considered themselves to be partially disabled (table 34). 29/ Another 7 percent considered themselves to be totally disabled. Of the 337 household heads who reported partial disability, only 7 percent were in deprivation class 1, but 31 percent were in class 2. The largest proportion was in class 3 (35 percent) with decreasing proportions in the remaining classes. Of the 102 persons who considered themselves to be totally disabled, the largest proportion (41 percent) was in deprivation class 2.

Data in table 35 illustrate household income by level of disability. Of the household heads who reported partial disability, 14 percent had incomes under $1,000 in 1965, and 69 percent had incomes under $3,000. Two-thirds of the heads indicating total disability had incomes under $3,000.

As would be expected, disability is directly related to age (table 36). Of the household heads in the 35-44 age range, 9 percent were partially disabled; and this percentage increased steadily to 49 percent of those in the 75 and over age range. This relationship was not so pronounced for the totally disabled household heads: 6 percent for those aged 35-44 and only 10 percent for those 75 and over.

28/ Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1967, Bur. of the Census, U.S. Dept. Commerce, 88th ed., p. 68.

29/ Disability levels were based on responses for household heads to the following 2 questions: (1) Does your present health limit your ability to do work or chores, and (2) If "yes," is your ability to work limited totally or only partially?

Heads of nonfarm households had a slightly higher incidence of disability than did their farm counterparts (table 37). One-fourth of the nonfarm heads said they were partially disabled, compared with 21 percent of the farmers. Eight percent of the nonfarm heads indicated total disability, compared with 4 percent of the farmers.

Of the employed heads of households, excluding farmers and farm laborers, a relatively low proportion was disabled (table 38). The proportion ranged from a low of no disability among sales and private household workers to partial disability for 13 percent of service workers. These proportions contrast with partial disability for 23 percent of famers and farm managers and 25 percent of farm laborers. Two percent of farmers and farm managers reported total disability. Partial disability rather than total was the level indicated in most cases. But agricultural occupations, unlike many others, can use workers with varying degrees of disability and during varying periods of time.

EDUCATION OF CHILDREN

All societies are faced with the task of transmitting their vital ideas and values to succeeding generations if the societies wish to remain intact. However, the need for effective educational and training processes is often greatest in regions with the fewest resources for meeting this need. A commonly accepted measure of the resource input is "current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance." In 1967, Arkansas ranked 45th of the 48 contiguous States with $393. 30/ Oklahoma ranked 28th with $533, and Missouri was 31st with $506. These amounts may be compared with the U.S. average of $569, and the five leading State expenditures of $657 to $912.

Some balance is restored to the discussion by adding that school children together with society must provide major imputs of effort and time if educational endeavors are to succeed. Major adjustments need to be made by the educational system in low-income regions, especially if the failure rate among students is to be reduced to tolerable levels. An example of the need for such adjustments can be seen in the following observations from a recent study that considered the capabilities and aspirations of 165 high school seniors in the southwestern part of the Arkansas Ozarks:

> One implicit hypothesis when the research began was that the basic school curriculum was essentially adequate, but should be tailored to develop the aspirations of the low income subjects. A more appropriate hypothesis in light of this study would seem to be that the basic education is not adequate. While the students had aspirations similar to those of students in other areas,

30/ Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1967, op. cit., p. 106.

their reading skills were below national norms, disqualifying many from capability scores matching their aspirations. 31/

From the study's observations, we must conclude that the schools need to face the challenge of solving a basic reading skill deficiency to reduce student frustration. Further, this reading deficiency is probably indicative of other serious educational deficiencies prevalent in the Ozarks.

Heads of households interviewed in the present study believed their children need a high level of education (table 39). Only 2 percent of the 673 heads who were asked about educational needs for their children said that less than a high school education was sufficient. Another 23 percent thought that a high school education was sufficient. But a large group (60 percent) said that their children should finish college. Thus, parental aspirations for children's educational achievement were high. However, these aspirations varied with income. Two-thirds of the 516 heads with incomes of $3,000 and over thought their children should finish college, compared with 39 percent of the 157 heads with incomes under $3,000.

Heads of households with one or more sons in school were asked to estimate the expected educational attainment of their oldest son still in school (table 40). Of the 392 heads asked this question, 108 replied that they expected him to complete high school, while only 11 expected less achievement. A large group (208) replied that they expected him to finish college. These expectations varied with income. Fifty-nine percent of the 307 heads with incomes at and above $3,000 expected their oldest son still in school to finish college, compared with 32 percent of the 85 heads with incomes under $3,000.

Heads of households with any youngster who had dropped out before completing high school were asked why their son or daughter had taken such a step (table 41). Responses were provided by 470 heads of households, some of whom, of course, were elderly people whose children had quit at a time when such action was more acceptable. Many respondents (30 percent) gave marriage as the reason. Nineteen percent indicated "refusal to go to school," and 19 percent gave "wanted to go to work" as the explanation. Ten percent said that the youngster was needed at home.

The incidence of one or more dropouts in a family was 52 percent (321 of 616) of all the households with incomes under $3,000, compared with 19 percent (149 of 797) of all those with $3,000 and over. Reasons for dropping out were roughly the same regardless of income except for the reason "needed at home." This reason was given by 15 percent of the 60 households with incomes up to $1,000, and decreased steadily to 6 percent of the 86 households with incomes of $3,000 to $4,999.

31/ Max F. Jordan, James F. Golden, and Lloyd D. Bender, Aspirations and Capabilities of Rural Youth in Relation to Present and Projected Labor Market Requirements, Univ. of Ark. Exper. Sta. cooperating with Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Bul. 722, May 1967, p. 32.

Few school dropouts quit before they were 14 years of age, mainly because public law required an eighth grade education for all who could possibly achieve it. But at age 14, the dropout rate began to increase sharply; 11 percent quit school at 14, 19 percent at 15, and 28 percent at 16 (table 42). Whether the age at which the youngest dropout quits school is related to household income is a crucial question. The following is offered as evidence that this relationship does exist. Of the 141 school dropouts aged 14 and 15, 108 (34 percent) were from the 321 households with one or more dropouts and incomes of less than $3,000. The remaining 33 dropouts (22 percent) were from the 149 households with one or more dropouts and incomes of $3,000 or more. Thus, for these selected age group-income combinations, the dropout rate was 12 percent higher for households with low incomes than for those with higher incomes. An identical procedure of considering the 240 dropouts aged 16 and 17 yields a 46-percent dropout rate associated with the low-income households and a 62-percent rate for the upper income households. Thus, school dropouts in low-income households with one or more dropouts tended to be younger than dropouts in the higher income households. These results indicate that a poverty cycle has developed, and positive action is needed if incomes and school systems in the region are to be improved.

A PROFILE OF ECONOMICALLY DEPRIVED HOUSEHOLDS 32/

The factors that limit a person's earning capacity can be divided into two general types:

1. Those found largely in the physical limitations of advanced age, disability, and sex (female) which are not amenable to change. 33/

2. Those subject to modification through education and training, including primarily the skills and attitudes of the labor force.

The two types are not mutually exclusive. Individual capability for change is tempered by a combination of physical and acquired characteristics. The limitations of advanced age or disability depend on attitudes of and toward the old and disabled and the level of education that the old and disabled have. Thus, while solutions will vary with individuals, most human resource problems can be solved by a combination of self-help and welfare assistance. Classifying these problems by type as outlined above is useful in defining their wide range and in indicating courses of future study.

32/ Portions taken from Jackson V. McElveen, op. cit., pp. 49-51.

33/ Sex was considered a physical limitation in that certain occupations requiring physical strength are generally closed to women. Race was not considered to be a limiting factor even though it is a genetic or physical characteristic that is not changeable. Any adverse effects of racial differentiation are considered amenable to change.

Research currently underway may modify or replace the classification as additional information becomes available.

Households in deprived classes 1 and 2 may be grouped into the following categories based on the age, physical health, and sex of the household head. The significance of these groupings is explained below:

1. Household heads 65 and older. Thirty-four percent of the households were headed by persons aged 65 and over, but this age group comprised 51 percent of all those economically deprived (table 43). Reduced physical stamina, typically associated with persons at this age level, will prevent their general escape from poverty through work. Welfare, increased social security benefits, and other types of assistance would need to play a major role for the economic situation of this group to improve substantially. However, there will be individuals who have remaining work capability and who maintain self-esteem chiefly through work. Perhaps outdoor recreation, a rapidly growing economic sector in the Ozarks with a seasonal demand peak for labor, can and will use large numbers of these elderly workers. Outdoor recreation and related enterprises require a relatively large number of part-time laborers for jobs less physically demanding than most industrial jobs.

2. Disabled household heads under 65. Fourteen percent of the households were headed by persons who were disabled and under 65, but this group comprised 22 percent of all those economically deprived (table 43). Of the 76 disabled heads under 65 in the deprivation classes, 17 had suffered heart or brain impairment, eight had had accidents, and five had blood pressure problems (table 44). Most of these disorders are usually associated with the upper age ranges. One encouraging aspect is that a younger person who becomes disabled may be adaptable to training for new skills.

   Significantly, 19 of the 76 disabled heads who were deprived had four or more children (up to 19 years of age) at home (table 45). Fifty-nine percent had one or more children at home. Disability, low incomes, and youngsters in the household are unfavorable situations for escape from deprivation.

3. Able-bodied male household heads under 45. This group comprised 26 percent of the sample but only 11 percent of those households classified as deprived. People would probably agree that the remaining productive life expectancy of this group warrants investment by society. This investment would be in the form of job training, retraining, or other assistance designed to help persons obtain better jobs. The needs of these families are often greater than those of other groups because of the high incidence of children at home--about 87 percent of all household size-income classes (table 45). Nearly one-fourth of the young, able-bodied men of

classes 1 and 2 had less than an eighth grade education, and another 28 percent had completed eight grades (table 46). Of the remaining classes, only 9 percent had less than an eighth grade education, and 15 percent had completed eight grades (table 47). Of 37 members of classes 1 and 2, 28 said they would accept free job training, and 29 were also willing to change to a better job provided they could remain in their present community (table 48). Of the other classes, 233 of 325 heads said they would accept free job training, and 209 were also willing to change to a better job if they could stay in their present community (table 49).

4. Able-bodied male household heads 45 to 65. To the extent that advancing age may limit types of adjustment through either extensive training or geographic mobility, these men are frequently referred to as "boxed in." This group comprised 22 percent of the entire sample, but only 11 percent of the deprived households (table 43). Of group members classified as deprived (classes 1 and 2), 45 percent had one or more children at home (table 45). One-half had less than an eighth grade education, and 58 percent were farmers (table 46). For the 272 household heads in other classes who were able-bodied males between 45 and 65, 41 percent had children at home (table 45). But more importantly, only 19 percent had less than an eighth grade education, and 33 percent were farmers (table 47). Thus, of the deprived group, a larger proportion than of the other classes had children at home, had less than an eighth grade education, and were farmers by occupation. Of the 312 able-bodied heads 45 to 64 years of age, 40 were classified as deprived. Nineteen of the 40 were asked about their willingness to accept free job training. Fourteen of the 19 indicated that they would accept such training (table 48). Also, 16 of them expressed willingness to change jobs for more pay if they did not have to leave their present community. However, members of the group in classes 3 through 6 (272 household heads) expressed less willingness to accept job training or to change jobs (table 49). Only half of those asked were willing to accept free job training and 54 percent were willing to change to a better job if able to remain in the community where they are now living.

5. Able-bodied female heads under 65. This group is comprised of 60 household heads, or 4 percent of the entire sample (table 43). They comprised 5 percent of the deprived household heads. Eighty-nine percent of deprived household heads in this group had children at home (table 45). Nearly two-fifths had completed less than eight grades of school, and 17 percent were classified as farmers (table 46). Eleven of the 17 women who were asked indicated a willingness to accept free job training, and seven were willing to change to a better job if they could remain in their present community (table 48).

Table 1.--Farm and nonfarm households by number of persons in household, 1966

Number in household	Total households		Farm		Nonfarm	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All households	1,413	100	293	100	1,120	100
1	209	15	11	4	198	18
2	513	36	125	43	388	35
3	228	16	57	19	171	15
4	173	12	37	13	136	12
5	147	10	35	12	112	10
6	70	5	13	4	57	5
7	31	2	8	3	23	2
8	22	2	3	1	19	2
9 or more	20	2	4	1	16	1
	No.		No.		No.	
Mean number of persons per household	3.07		3.24		3.03	
	Pct.		Pct.		Pct.	
Proportion of farm and rural nonfarm households in sample	100		21		79	

Table 2.--Farm and nonfarm households by number of persons in household and race, 1966 1/

Number in household	Farm				Nonfarm			
	White		Other races		White		Other races	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All households	290	100	3	100	1,058	100	62	100
1	11	4	0	0	182	17	16	26
2	124	43	1	33	377	36	11	18
3	57	20	0	0	165	15	6	10
4	36	12	1	33	134	13	2	3
5	35	12	0	0	102	10	10	16
6	13	4	0	0	54	5	3	5
7	8	3	0	0	22	2	1	2
8	3	1	0	0	10	1	9	14
9 or more	3	1	1	34	12	1	4	6
	No.		No.		No.		No.	
Mean number of persons per household	3.22		5.00		2.97		3.98	

1/ Of the 1,413 households in the sample, 94.4 percent were white and 4.6 percent were other races.

Table 3.--Farm and nonfarm households by age of head, 1966

Age	Total households		Farm		Nonfarm	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	293	100	1,120	100
Under 25 years	52	4	1	0	51	4
25-34	156	11	23	8	133	12
35-44	226	16	49	17	177	16
45-54	250	18	75	26	175	16
55-64	244	17	77	26	167	15
65-74	310	22	50	17	260	23
75 and over	175	12	18	6	157	14
	Years		Years		Years	
Median age	55		54		54	
Mean age	55		54		54	

Table 4.--Farm and nonfarm households by age and race of head, 1966

Age	Farm				Nonfarm			
	White		Other races		White		Other races	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	290	100	3	100	1,058	100	62	100
Under 25 years	1	0	0	0	50	5	1	2
25-34	23	8	0	0	130	12	3	5
35-44	48	17	1	33	163	16	14	22
45-54	74	25	1	33	168	16	7	11
55-64	77	27	0	0	161	15	6	10
65-74	49	17	1	34	237	22	23	37
75 and over	18	6	0	0	149	14	8	13
	Years		Years		Years		Years	
Median age	54		--		56		61	
Mean age	54		51		55		58	

Table 5.--Households by 1965 income, and by sex of head, 1966 1/

Household income in 1965	Total households		Households with male heads		Households with female heads	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All households	1,413	100	1,171	100	242	100
0 - $999	101	7	41	3	60	25
$1,000 - $1,999	295	21	187	16	108	45
$2,000 - $2,999	220	16	191	16	29	12
$3,000 - $4,999	328	23	303	26	25	10
$5,000 - $7,499	271	19	259	22	12	5
$7,500 - $9,999	98	7	95	8	3	1
$10,000 and over	92	6	90	8	2	1
Not reported	8	1	5	1	3	1

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.

Table 6.--Farm and nonfarm households by income sources of household, 1965 1/

Income sources of household	Total households		Farm		Nonfarm	
	No.	Pct. 2/	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All households	1,413	100	293	100	1,120	100
$10,000 income and over	92	7	18	6	74	7
Applicable households: 3/						
Wages and salaries	738	52	149	51	589	53
Farming or business	356	25	250	85	106	9
Rents, interest, and dividends	189	13	42	14	147	13
Retirement	397	28	69	24	328	29
Unemployment	160	11	28	10	132	12
Welfare	285	20	19	6	266	24

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.
2/ Items do not add to total shown because some people had multiple sources of income.
3/ Comprised of 1,321 households earning under $10,000.

Table 7.--Household income in 1965 by number of persons in household, all households, 1966 1/

Number in household	Total house-holds	Household income in 1965															
		0-$999		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000-$2,999		$3,000-$4,999		$5,000-$7,499		$7,500-$9,999		$10,000 and over		Not reported	
	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All households	1,413	101	7	295	21	220	16	328	23	271	19	98	7	92	6	8	1
1	209	59	28	108	52	13	6	13	6	10	5	1	0	2	1	3	2
2	513	28	5	127	25	123	24	91	18	69	13	31	6	40	8	4	1
3	228	6	3	24	11	34	15	74	32	62	27	17	7	11	5	0	0
4	173	5	3	11	6	15	9	47	27	56	32	21	12	18	11	0	0
5	147	0	0	14	10	12	8	51	35	36	24	19	13	14	9	1	1
6	70	1	1	4	6	10	14	26	37	23	33	4	6	2	3	0	0
7	31	0	0	3	10	4	13	8	26	10	32	1	3	5	16	0	0
8	22	2	9	3	14	6	27	7	32	1	4	3	14	0	0	0	0
9 or more	20	0	0	1	5	3	15	11	55	4	20	1	5	0	0	0	0

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.

Table 8.--Household income in 1965 by number of persons in household, whites, 1966 1/

Number in household	Total white house-holds	Household income in 1965															
		0-$999		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000-$2,999		$3,000-$4,999		$5,000-$7,499		$7,500-$9,999		$10,000 and over		Not reported	
	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All households	1,348	91	7	280	21	203	15	312	23	267	20	98	7	90	7	7	0
1	193	54	28	100	52	13	7	10	5	10	5	1	0	2	1	3	2
2	501	26	5	123	25	118	23	90	18	69	14	31	6	40	8	4	1
3	222	5	2	23	10	32	14	72	33	62	28	17	8	11	5	0	0
4	170	5	3	11	6	12	7	47	28	56	33	21	12	18	11	0	0
5	137	0	0	13	9	12	9	46	34	35	25	19	14	12	9	0	0
6	67	1	2	4	6	9	13	26	39	21	31	4	6	2	3	0	0
7	30	0	0	3	10	3	10	8	27	10	33	1	3	5	17	0	0
8	13	0	0	2	15	3	23	4	31	1	8	3	23	0	0	0	0
9 or more	15	0	0	1	7	1	7	9	60	3	20	1	6	0	0	0	0

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.

Table 9.--Household income in 1965 by number of persons in household, races other than the white race, 1966 1/

Number in household	Total other races	Household income in 1965															
		0-$999		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000-$2,999		$3,000-$4,999		$5,000-$7,499		$7,500-$9,999		$10,000 and over		Not reported	
	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All households	65	10	15	15	23	17	26	16	25	4	6	0	0	2	3	1	2
1	16	5	31	8	50	0	0	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	12	2	17	4	33	5	42	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	6	1	17	1	17	2	33	2	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	3	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	10	0	0	1	10	0	0	5	50	1	10	0	0	2	20	1	10
6	3	0	0	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	1	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	9	2	22	1	11	3	33	3	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 or more	5	0	0	0	0	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.

Table 10.--Criteria for establishing relative income deprivation based on household size and 1965 income 1/

Household income in 1965	Household size-income class					
	1--Seriously deprived	2--Deprived	3--Marginal	4--Probably not deprived	5--Definitely not deprived	6--(other) (Undetermined) 1/
	Number of persons in household					
0 - $999	2 or more	1	---	---	---	---
$1,000 - $1,999	5 or more	2-4	1	---	---	---
$2,000 - $2,999	9 or more	4-8	2 or 3	1	---	---
$3,000 - $4,999	---	8 or more	4-7	2 or 3	1	---
$5,000 - $7,499	---	---	9 or more	4-8	1-3	---
$7,500 - $9,999	---	---	---	6 or more	1-5	---
$10,000 and over	---	---	---	9 or more	1-8	---

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.
2/ Either income or size class not reported.

Source: Developed jointly by agricultural economists and rural sociologists working on related studies in the following regions: Coastal Plain, South Carolina; Delta, Mississippi and Louisiana; Ozarks, Arkansas and Missouri. These categories grew out of the need to define income deprivation more precisely than that provided by income alone and for uniformity in making comparisons of data by regions.

Table 11.--Number of households by household size-income class and 1965 income, 1966 1/

Household income in 1965	Household size-income class 2/					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Number of households					
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
0 - $999	42	59	---	---	---	8
$1,000 - $1,999	25	162	108	---	---	---
$2,000 - $2,999	3	47	157	13	---	---
$3,000 - $4,999	---	18	132	165	13	---
$5,000 - $7,499	---	---	4	126	141	---
$7,500 - $9,999	---	---	---	9	89	---
$10,000 and over	---	---	---	---	92	---
	No. Pct.	No. Pct.	No. Pct.	No. Pct.	No. Pct.	No. Pct.
All households	70 5	286 20	401 28	313 22	335 24	8 1

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.
2/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 12.--Household size-income class by dependency, sex, and fertility ratios, all households, 1966

Ratios	Total households	Household size-income class 1/					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
	Number						
Dependency ratio	0.94	1.04	1.52	1.29	0.80	0.48	0.83
Age 1-14	1,191	88	233	334	337	194	5
Age 20-64	2,023	118	302	458	548	585	12
Age 65 and over	710	35	226	256	99	89	5
Sex ratio 2/	0.89	0.86	0.76	0.84	0.99	0.97	0.60
Males	1,179	56	207	304	295	311	6
Females	1,331	65	273	364	299	320	10
Fertility ratio	0.64	0.90	0.91	0.76	0.60	0.41	0.00
Children under 5	338	19	60	102	96	61	0
Women 15-44	530	21	66	134	159	148	2

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.
2/ Based on heads and spouses if present; excludes children and others in the household.

Table 13.--Household size-income class by dependency, sex, and fertility ratios, whites, 1966

Ratios	Total households	Household size-income class 1/					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
		Number					
Dependency ratio	0.92	0.97	1.55	1.26	0.79	0.48	0.70
Age 1-14	1,104	66	198	318	331	189	2
Age 20-64	1,931	99	265	440	537	580	10
Age 65 and over	666	30	213	238	93	87	5
Sex ratio 2/	0.90	0.89	0.77	0.85	0.99	0.97	0.56
Males	1,139	50	193	294	290	307	5
Females	1,271	56	251	345	293	317	9
Fertility ratio	0.63	0.78	0.93	0.75	0.60	0.42	0.00
Children under 5	320	14	53	98	94	61	0
Women 15-44	509	18	57	130	157	146	1

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.
2/ Based on heads and spouses if present; excludes children and others in the household.

Table 14.--Household size-income class by dependency, sex, and fertility ratios, races other than the white race, 1966

Ratios	Total households	Household size-income class 1/					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
		Number					
Dependency ratio	1.42	1.42	1.30	1.89	1.09	1.40	1.50
Age 1-14	87	22	35	16	6	5	3
Age 20-64	92	19	37	18	11	5	2
Age 65 and over	44	5	13	18	6	2	0
Sex ratio 2/	0.67	0.67	0.64	0.53	0.83	1.33	1.00
Males	40	6	14	10	5	4	1
Females	60	9	22	19	6	3	1
Fertility ratio	0.86	1.67	0.78	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
Children under 5	18	5	7	4	2	0	0
Women 15-44	21	3	9	4	2	2	1

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.
2/ Based on heads and spouses if present; excludes children and others in the household.

Table 15.--Household size-income class by sex of household head, 1966

Sex	Total house-holds	Household size-income class 1/											
		1		2		3		4		5		6	
	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	68	5	285	20	401	28	313	22	335	24	11	1
Male	1,171	54	5	206	18	301	26	294	25	310	26	6	0
Female	242	14	6	79	33	100	41	19	8	25	10	5	2

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 16.--Household size-income class by age of household head, 1966

Age	Total house-holds	Household size-income class 1/											
		1		2		3		4		5		6	
	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	68	5	285	20	401	28	313	22	335	24	11	1
Under 25 years	52	1	2	6	11	16	31	15	29	14	27	0	0
25-34	156	6	4	14	9	43	27	48	31	45	29	0	0
35-44	226	11	5	33	15	56	25	61	27	64	28	1	0
45-54	250	10	4	31	13	46	18	71	28	90	36	2	1
55-64	244	17	7	44	18	61	25	57	23	62	26	3	1
65-74	310	14	5	89	29	109	35	45	14	50	16	3	1
75 and over	175	9	5	68	39	70	40	16	9	10	6	2	1

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 17.--Household size-income class by educational attainment of household head, 1966

Years of school completed	Total households		Household size-income class 1/											
			1		2		3		4		5		6	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	68	5	285	20	401	28	313	22	335	24	11	1
0 years	33	100	2	6	11	33	15	46	2	6	1	3	2	6
1-4	152	100	12	8	58	38	44	29	23	15	14	9	1	1
5-7	252	100	26	10	70	28	96	38	34	13	25	10	1	1
8	376	100	18	5	90	24	119	32	84	22	65	17	0	0
9-11	229	100	7	3	29	13	63	27	64	28	63	28	3	1
12	249	100	2	1	19	8	51	20	75	30	101	41	1	0
College, 1-3 years	60	100	1	2	4	7	8	13	13	22	32	53	2	3
College, 4 or more years	62	100	0	0	4	6	5	8	18	29	34	55	1	2

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 18.--Age of household head by educational attainment of head, 1966

Years of school completed	Total households		Age of head													
			Under 25		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65-74		75 and over	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	52	100	156	100	226	100	250	100	244	100	310	100	175	100
0 years	33	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	2	2	1	6	2	16	9
1-4	152	11	0	0	3	2	15	7	19	8	24	10	55	18	36	20
5-7	252	18	4	8	10	6	26	12	37	15	55	22	68	22	52	30
8	376	27	4	8	20	13	48	21	74	30	83	34	102	33	45	26
9-11	229	16	18	35	33	21	50	22	48	19	40	16	28	9	12	7
12	249	18	21	40	62	40	54	24	50	20	26	11	26	8	10	5
College 1-3 years	60	4	4	7	9	6	14	6	8	3	9	4	15	5	1	1
College 4 or more years	62	4	1	2	19	12	16	7	8	3	5	2	10	3	3	2

Table 19.--Household income in 1965 by employment status of household head, 1966 1/

Employment status	Total households	Household income in 1965: $0-$999	$1,000-$1,999	$2,000-$2,999	$3,000-$4,999	$5,000-$7,499	$7,500-$9,999	$10,000 and over	Not reported
					Number				
All heads	1,413	100	293	214	332	280	94	92	8
In labor force 2/	868	19	70	105	263	246	81	83	1
Armed forces	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
Civilian labor force	864	19	70	104	262	245	81	82	1
Employed	826	13	66	94	251	241	81	79	1
Unemployed 3/	38	6	4	10	11	4	0	3	0
Not in labor force	545	81	223	109	69	34	13	9	7
Enrolled in school	3	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Other									
Housewife	186	56	91	15	13	5	3	0	3
Retired	255	18	93	71	36	19	8	7	3
Disabled	71	5	25	14	18	5	1	2	1
Retired and disabled	30	1	14	8	2	4	1	0	0

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.
2/ Total represents 61.4 percent of all household heads.
3/ This constitutes 4.4 percent of civilian labor force.

Table 20.--Household income in 1965 by occupation of employed household head, 1966 1/

Item	Total households	Household income in 1965															
		0-$999		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000-$2,999		$3,000-$4,999		$5,000-$7,499		$7,500-$9,999		$10,000 and over		Not reported	
	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Household heads in civilian labor force	864	19	2	70	8	104	12	262	30	245	28	81	10	82	10	1	0
Unemployed	38	6	16	4	11	10	26	11	29	4	10	0	0	3	8	0	0
Employed household heads	826	13	2	66	8	94	11	251	30	241	29	81	10	79	10	1	0
Professional, technical, and kindred	60	0	0	2	3	0	0	15	25	21	35	8	13	14	24	0	0
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm)	89	1	1	5	6	7	8	20	22	22	25	10	11	23	26	1	1
Clerical and kindred	28	0	0	1	4	4	14	6	21	6	21	6	22	5	18	0	0
Sales workers	17	0	0	0	0	2	12	4	24	5	29	0	0	6	35	0	0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	147	1	1	4	3	13	9	51	34	55	37	19	13	4	3	0	0
Operatives and kindred	165	2	1	4	3	14	8	58	35	58	35	19	12	10	6	0	0
Service workers	52	2	4	5	10	3	6	14	27	17	32	9	17	2	4	0	0
Private household	2	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laborers, except farm and mine	60	0	0	3	5	12	20	23	38	19	32	0	0	3	5	0	0
Farmers and farm managers	186	6	3	37	20	32	17	56	30	34	18	10	6	11	6	0	0
Farm laborers	12	0	0	3	25	4	33	2	17	2	17	0	0	1	8	0	0
Other	8	1	12	1	13	2	25	2	25	2	25	0	0	0	0	0	0

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.

Table 21.--Educational attainment of household head by employment status of head, 1966

Employment status	Total house-holds	Years of school completed by head							
		0	1-4	5-7	8	9-11	12	13-15	16 and over
		Number							
All heads	1,413	33	152	252	376	229	249	60	62
In labor force 1/	868	7	51	108	221	170	210	45	56
Armed forces	4	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0
Civilian labor force	864	7	51	107	221	169	208	45	56
Employed	826	6	48	102	206	164	203	42	55
Unemployed	38	1	3	5	15	5	5	3	1
Not in labor force	545	26	101	144	155	59	39	15	6
Enrolled in school	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Other									
Housewife	186	3	28	53	56	26	14	6	0
Retired	255	16	51	69	71	16	20	7	5
Disabled	71	7	13	16	18	12	4	0	1
Retired and disabled	30	0	9	5	9	5	1	1	0

1/ Total represents 61.4 percent of all household heads.

Table 22.--Occupation of household head by education of head, 1966

Occupation	Total households	Years of school completed by head															
		0		1-4		5-7		8		9-11		12		13-15		16 and over	
	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	33	2	152	11	252	18	376	27	229	16	249	18	60	4	62	4
Unemployed	38	1	3	3	8	5	13	15	39	5	13	5	13	3	8	1	3
Not in labor force	545	26	5	101	19	144	26	155	28	59	11	39	7	15	3	6	1
Armed forces	4	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	1	25	2	50	0	0	0	0
Employed civilian heads	826	6	1	48	6	102	12	206	25	164	20	203	24	42	5	55	7
Professional, technical, and kindred	60	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	4	7	13	21	6	10	35	58
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm)	89	0	0	5	6	6	7	18	20	17	19	25	28	11	12	7	8
Clerical and kindred	28	0	0	1	4	1	4	2	7	4	14	13	46	4	14	3	11
Sales workers	17	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	29	3	18	4	24	4	23	0	0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	147	0	0	10	7	14	9	44	30	35	24	36	24	7	5	1	1
Operatives and kindred	165	2	1	5	3	21	13	45	27	42	26	48	29	2	1	0	0
Service workers, except private household	52	0	0	3	6	5	9	15	29	11	21	15	29	2	4	1	2
Private household workers	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laborers, except farm and mine	60	4	7	5	8	11	18	9	15	16	27	14	23	1	2	0	0
Farmers and farm managers	186	0	0	14	8	38	20	62	33	27	15	33	18	4	2	8	4
Farm laborers	12	0	0	4	33	3	25	2	17	2	17	1	8	0	0	0	0
Other	8	0	0	1	12	1	13	2	25	2	25	1	13	1	12	0	0

Table 23.--Household size-income class by occupation of household head, 1966

Occupation	Total households		Household size-income class 1/											
			1		2		3		4		5		6	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	68	5	285	20	401	28	313	22	335	24	11	1
Unemployed	38	100	4	10	12	32	8	21	9	24	4	10	1	3
Not in labor force	545	100	41	7	178	33	206	38	63	12	49	9	8	1
Armed forces	4	100	0	0	0	0	1	25	2	50	1	25	0	0
Employed civilian heads	826	100	23	3	95	12	186	22	239	29	281	34	2	0
Professional, technical, and kindred	60	100	0	0	3	5	8	13	15	25	34	57	0	0
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm)	89	100	1	1	6	7	9	10	28	31	44	50	1	1
Clerical and kindred	28	100	0	0	3	11	5	18	6	21	14	50	0	0
Sales workers	17	100	0	0	0	0	3	18	6	35	8	47	0	0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	147	100	0	0	12	8	37	25	53	36	45	31	0	0
Operatives and kindred	165	100	4	3	12	7	41	25	48	29	60	36	0	0
Service workers, except private household	52	100	3	6	3	6	12	23	14	27	20	38	0	0
Private household workers	2	100	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laborers, except farm and mine	60	100	2	3	7	12	22	37	19	32	10	16	0	0
Farmers and farm managers	186	100	10	5	43	23	45	24	44	24	43	23	1	1
Farm laborers	12	100	1	8	5	42	1	8	3	25	2	17	0	0
Other	8	100	2	25	0	0	2	25	3	38	1	12	0	0

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 24.--Farm and nonfarm households by number of income earners in household, 1966

Number of income earners	Total households		Farm		Nonfarm	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All households	1,413	100	293	100	1,120	100
0	8	1	0	0	8	1
1	787	56	157	54	630	56
2	538	38	116	40	422	38
3	56	4	16	5	40	4
4	20	1	4	1	16	1
5 and over	4	0	0	0	4	0

Table 25.--Farm and nonfarm households by multiple employment of head, 1966

Multiple employment	Total house-holds	Farm		Nonfarm	
	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	293	21	1,120	79
Nonapplicable heads 1/	586	38 2/	6	548	94
Employed civilian heads					
More than one job	129	102	40	27	5
One job	698	153	60	545	95

1/ Those in the Armed Forces or not employed.
2/ Five of the farmers and 33 of the nonfarmers considered themselves unemployed; the remainder were not in the labor force.

Table 26.--Age of household head by number of jobs held by head, 1961-65

Number of jobs held	Total households		Age of head													
			Under 25		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65-74		75 and over	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	52	100	156	100	226	100	250	100	244	100	310	100	175	100
Not in labor force in last 5 years	356	25	2	4	3	2	12	5	17	7	38	16	141	46	143	82
Employed heads	1,057	75	50	96	153	98	214	95	233	93	206	84	169	54	32	8
0	1	0	0 1/	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
1	388	37	2	4	34	22	89	41	113	48	84	41	53	31	13	41
2	390	37	13	26	41	27	70	33	71	30	85	41	92	55	18	56
3	141	13	9	18	26	17	28	13	34	15	23	11	20	12	1	3
4	61	6	12	24	19	12	12	6	4	2	10	5	4	2	0	0
5	40	4	7	14	17	11	8	4	6	3	2	1	0	0	0	0
6 and over	36	3	7	14	16	11	7	3	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Average, 1961-65	1.93	--	3.7	--	3.0	--	2.1	--	1.9	--	1.8	--	1.8	--	1.6	--

1/ Percentages based on those in labor force rather than total in sample.

Table 27.--Age of household head by periods of unemployment of head, 1961-65

Item	Total households		Age of head													
			Under 25		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65-74		75 and over	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	52	100	156	100	226	100	250	100	244	100	310	100	175	100
Not in labor force in last 5 years	356	25	2	4	3	2	12	5	17	7	38	16	141	45	143	82
Out of labor force in last 5 years	192	14	2	4	6	4	11	5	22	9	40	16	94	30	17	10
No unemployment in last 5 years	810	57	37	71	133	85	194	86	203	81	156	64	73	24	14	8
Applicable heads, periods of unemployment																
1	45	3	10	19	11	7	8	3	5	2	8	3	2	1	1	0
2	6	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
3	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
6 or more	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 28.--Age of household head by months of unemployment of head, 1961-65

Item	Total households		Age of head													
			Under 25		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65-74		75 and over	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	52	100	156	100	226	100	250	100	244	100	310	100	175	100
Not in labor force in last 5 years	356	25	2	4	3	2	12	5	17	7	38	16	141	45	143	82
Out of labor force in last 5 years	192	14	2	4	6	4	11	5	22	9	40	16	94	30	17	10
No unemployment in last 5 years	810	57	37	71	133	85	194	86	203	81	156	64	73	24	14	8
Applicable heads, months unemployed																
1	6	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
2	11	1	2	4	4	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0
3	9	1	4	7	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
4	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
5	5	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
6 or more	21	2	3	6	6	4	3	1	4	2	3	2	2	1	0	0

Table 29.--Average hours worked by household head, by occupation of head, 1966

Occupation	Total households	Average hours worked in 1 week: 1-20	21-40	41-60	60 and over	Not reported
	Number					
All heads	1,413					
Not in labor force, in armed forces, and unemployed	587					
Farmers and farm managers 1/	186					
Employed civilian heads	640	13	323	177	100	27
Professional, technical, and kindred	60	0	31	17	7	5
Managers, officials, and proprietors	89	5	24	13	40	7
Clerical and kindred	28	0	18	7	3	0
Sales workers	17	0	6	6	4	1
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	147	2	83	45	15	2
Operatives and kindred	165	2	88	54	17	4
Service workers, including private household	54	0	25	23	5	1
Farm laborers and farm foremen	12	1	6	2	1	2
Laborers excluding farm and mine	60	3	39	9	7	2
Other	8	0	3	1	1	3
	Percent					
Proportion	100	2	50	28	16	4

1/ Hours vary too much for accurate estimate.

Table 30.--Main farm enterprise of sample farm households by county per capita income strata, 1966

Main farm enterprise	Total farms		County per capita income strata 1/: Low		Medium		High	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All farms	293	100	71	100	84	100	138	100
Beef cattle	177	61	41	58	51	61	85	62
Dairy	45	15	8	11	11	13	26	19
Broilers	10	3	0	0	1	1	9	7
Eggs	6	2	1	2	3	4	2	1
Cotton	3	1	1	1	0	0	2	1
General	52	18	20	28	18	21	14	10

1/ The 125 counties comprising the Ozarks region were arrayed by 1960 per capita income of inhabitants. Three strata of counties were then designated low, medium, and high on the basis of per capita income.

Table 31.--Tenure of farm operators in study group, 1966

Tenure	Number	Percent
All farms	293	100
Own and rent	14	5
Own	248	85
Rent	26	9
Manage	4	1
Sharecrop	0	0
Part-owner	1	0
Contract producer	0	0

Table 32.--Gross farm income of farm operators in study group, 1965 1/

Gross farm income	Number	Percent
All farms	293	100
0 - $49	4	1
$50 - 249	23	8
$250 - 499	30	10
$500 - 999	53	18
$1,000 - 2,499	85	29
$2,500 - 4,999	38	13
$5,000 - 7,499	25	9
$7,500 and over	35	12

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.

Table 33.--Home production of food, all farm and nonfarm households and those classified as deprived, 1966

Home production of food	Total households		Farm		Nonfarm	
	No.	Pct. 1/	No.	Pct. 1/	No.	Pct. 1/
All households	1,413	100	293	--	1,120	--
Planted garden	851	60	244	83	607	54
Processed poultry	205	15	98	33	107	10
Butchered beef	195	14	119	41	76	7
Butchered hog	149	11	84	29	65	6
Produced some meat	380	27	194	66	186	17
Households in household size-income classes 1 and 2 2/	353	100				
Planted garden	241	68	66	94	175	62
Processed poultry	67	19	28	40	39	14
Butchered beef	33	9	25	36	8	3
Butchered hog	38	11	24	34	14	5
Produced some meat	100	28	51	73	49	17

1/ The percentages are based on home production of food by 293 farmers and are not mutually exclusive.

2/ See table 10 for initial presentation of deprivation classes.

Table 34.--Household size-income class by level of disability of household head, 1966

Level of disability	Total households		Household size-income class 1/											
			1		2		3		4		5		6	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	68	5	285	20	401	28	313	22	335	24	11	1
None	974	100	35	4	137	14	256	26	244	25	298	31	4	0
Partial	337	100	24	7	106	31	117	35	56	17	30	9	4	1
Total	102	100	9	9	42	41	28	27	13	13	7	7	3	3

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 35.--Household income in 1965 by level of disability of household head, 1966 1/

Level of disability	Total house-holds	Household income in 1965															
		0-$999		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000-$2,999		$3,000-$4,999		$5,000-$7,499		$7,500-$9,999		$10,000 and over		Not reported	
	No	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	98	7	295	21	220	15	328	23	271	19	98	7	92	7	11	1
None	974	45	4	145	15	125	13	246	25	241	25	84	9	84	9	4	0
Partial	337	46	14	110	33	74	22	63	19	22	6	12	3	6	2	4	1
Total	102	7	7	40	39	21	20	19	19	8	8	2	2	2	2	3	3

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.

Table 36.--Level of disability of household head by age of head, 1966

Age	Total households		Level of disability					
			None		Partial		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	974	69	337	24	102	7
Under 25 years	52	100	51	98	1	2	0	0
25-34	156	100	139	89	16	10	1	1
35-44	226	100	193	85	19	9	14	6
45-54	250	100	203	81	29	12	18	7
55-64	244	100	150	62	66	27	28	11
65-74	310	100	166	53	120	39	24	8
75 and over	175	100	72	41	86	49	17	10

Table 37.--Level of disability of household head by farm and nonfarm residence of head, 1966

Residence	Total households		Level of disability					
			None		Partial		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	974	69	337	24	102	7
Farm	293	100	221	75	62	21	10	4
Nonfarm	1,120	100	753	67	275	25	92	8

Table 38.--Level of disability of household head by occupation of head, 1966

Occupation	Total households		Level of disability					
			None		Partial		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	974	69	337	24	102	7
Nonapplicable households 1/	595	100	264	44	235	40	96	16
Employed civilian heads	818	100	710	87	102	12	6	1
Professional, technical, and kindred	60	100	57	95	3	5	0	0
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm)	89	100	78	88	10	11	1	1
Clerical and kindred	28	100	25	89	3	11	0	0
Sales workers	17	100	17	100	0	0	0	0
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	147	100	135	92	12	8	0	0
Operatives and kindred	165	100	150	91	14	8	1	1
Service workers, except private household	52	100	45	87	7	13	0	0
Private household workers	2	100	2	100	0	0	0	0
Laborers, except farm and mine	60	100	53	88	7	12	0	0
Farmers and farm managers	186	100	139	75	43	23	4	2
Farm laborers	12	100	9	75	3	25	0	0

1/ Not in labor force (housewife, retired, disabled, student) or in armed forces.

Table 39.--Household heads' opinions on amount of education needed by their children, by 1965 household income, 1966 1/

Amount of education their children need	Total households		Household income in 1965: 0-$999		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000-$2,999		$3,000-$4,999		$5,000-$7,499		$7,500-$9,999		$10,000 and over		Not reported	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	101	7	295	21	220	16	328	23	271	19	98	7	92	6	8	1
Nonapplicable heads 2/	740	100	87	12	232	31	140	19	112	15	83	11	34	5	45	6	7	1
Applicable heads	673	100	14	100	63	100	80	100	216	100	188	100	64	100	47	100	1	100
1-5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6-9 years	5	1	1	7	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	100
Some high school	5	1	1	7	1	2	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Finish high school	155	23	5	36	27	43	25	32	59	27	29	15	8	13	2	4	0	0
Some college	89	13	3	21	10	16	17	21	27	13	23	12	6	9	3	7	0	0
Finish college	405	60	3	22	23	36	36	45	125	58	130	69	47	73	41	87	0	0
Trade, business school	14	2	1	7	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	3	3	5	1	2	0	0

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.
2/ Household heads with no children or children who had left the household.

Table 40.--Household heads' expectations of educational attainment of oldest student son, by 1965 household income, 1966 1/

Expected amount of education	Total households		Household income in 1965: 0-$999		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000-$2,999		$3,000-$4,999		$5.000-$7,499		$7,500-$9,999		$10,000 and over		Not reported	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	101	7	295	21	220	16	328	23	271	19	98	7	92	6	8	1
Nonapplicable heads 1/	1,021	100	95	9	261	25	175	17	205	20	163	16	57	6	58	6	7	1
Applicable heads	392	100	6	100	34	100	45	100	123	100	108	100	41	100	34	100	1	100
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6-9 years	3	1	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	100
Some high school	8	2	1	17	2	6	3	7	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Finish high school	108	27	2	33	17	50	18	40	42	34	22	20	6	14	1	3	0	0
Some college	50	13	1	16	3	9	6	13	20	16	15	14	4	10	1	3	0	0
Finish college	208	53	1	17	9	26	17	38	55	45	64	59	31	76	31	91	0	0
Trade, business school	15	4	0	0	3	9	1	2	5	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.
2/ Household heads with no children at home, with no sons, and with no children in school.

Table 41.--Reason youngest child quit school as perceived by household head, by 1965 household income, 1966 1/

Reason youngest child quit school	Total households	Household income in 1965															
		0-$999		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000-$2,999		$3,000-$4,999		$5,000-$7,499		$7,500-$9,999		$10,000 and over		Not reported	
	No.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	101	7	295	21	220	16	328	23	271	19	98	7	92	6	8	1
Nonapplicable heads 2/	943	41	4	138	15	116	12	242	26	225	24	86	9	88	9	7	1
Applicable heads	470	60	100	157	100	104	100	86	100	46	100	12	100	4	100	1	100
Got married	140	12	20	54	34	30	29	21	24	17	37	3	25	3	75	0	0
Refused to go	91	12	20	28	18	24	23	17	20	8	17	2	17	0	0	0	0
Wanted work	88	8	13	31	20	17	16	19	22	9	20	2	17	1	25	1	100
Needed at home	45	9	15	20	13	8	8	5	6	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor health	19	3	5	6	4	3	3	5	6	0	0	2	16	0	0	0	0
No transportation	12	2	3	4	2	4	4	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mentally retarded	11	1	2	2	1	3	3	4	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor grades	7	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Got pregnant	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	56	12	20	11	7	15	14	10	11	5	11	3	25	0	0	0	0

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.
2/ All children finished school, no children, and no children at home.

Table 42.--Age at which youngest child quit school, by 1965 household income, 1966 1/

Age at which youngest child quit school	Total households		Household income in 1965															
			0-$999		$1,000-$1,999		$2,000-$2,999		$3,000-$4,999		$5,000-$7,499		$7,500-$9,999		$10,000 and over		Not reported	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All heads	1,413	100	101	7	295	21	220	16	328	23	271	19	98	7	92	6	8	1
Nonapplicable heads 2/	943	100	41	4	138	15	116	12	242	26	225	24	86	9	88	9	7	1
Applicable heads	470	100	60	100	157	100	104	100	86	100	46	100	12	100	4	100	1	100
Up to 7 years	5	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	6	1	1	2	3	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	8	2	2	3	3	2	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	9	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	54	11	10	17	22	14	11	11	7	8	3	7	1	8	0	0	0	0
15	87	19	12	20	35	22	18	17	13	15	6	13	2	17	1	25	0	0
16	131	28	9	15	36	23	33	32	28	33	22	48	3	25	0	0	0	0
17	109	23	13	22	37	24	20	19	21	24	12	26	4	33	2	50	0	0
18	52	11	10	16	15	9	14	13	8	9	1	2	2	17	1	25	1	100
19 and over	7	2	0	0	2	1	4	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

1/ Income data based on earnings in 1965; survey was conducted during 1966.
2/ All children finished school, no children, and no children at home.

Table 43.--A typology of rural household heads in the Ozarks, 1966

Typology	Household size-income class 1/		
	Total	Classes 1 and 2	Classes 3-6
		Number	
All heads	1,413	353	1,060
Heads 65 or older	485	180	305
Heads under 65	928	173	755
Disabled	192	76	116
Not disabled	736	97	639
Males under 45	364	39	325
Males 45-64	312	40	272
Females	60	18	42
		Percent	
All heads	100	100	100
Heads 65 or older	34	51	29
Heads under 65	--	--	--
Disabled	14	22	11
Not disabled	--	--	--
Males under 45	26	11	30
Males 45-64	22	11	26
Females	4	5	4
All heads	100	25	75
Heads 65 or older	100	37	63
Heads under 65	100	19	81
Disabled	100	40	60
Not disabled	100	13	87
Males under 45	100	11	89
Males 45-64	100	13	87
Females	100	30	70

1/ Those in class 1 are classified as seriously deprived and those in class 2 are deprived. See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 44.--Disabled household heads under 65 by type of disability and household size-income class, 1966

Type of disability	Household size-income class 1/ Classes 1 and 2	Classes 3-6
	Number	
Heart, brain impairment	17	19
Accidents	8	18
Blood pressure problem	5	2
Ulcer	4	4
Arthritis	4	11
Nervous disorder	3	7
Tuberculosis	2	1
Other illnesses 2/	27	36
Other conditions	6	18
Total	76	116

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

2/ The other two categories are mostly temporary conditions that limited the respondents' ability to work.

Table 45.--Children at home by disability, sex, and household size-income class of household head, 1966

Number of children under age 19 at home	Disabled		Not disabled: Males, under 45		Males, 45-64		Females, under 65	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
	Heads in classes 1 and 2 1/							
None	31	41	5	13	22	55	2	11
1	8	10	5	13	6	15	5	28
2	9	12	5	13	6	15	4	22
3	9	12	8	20	3	8	4	22
4 and over	19	25	16	41	3	7	3	17
Total	76	100	39	100	40	100	18	100
	Heads in classes 3-6 1/							
None	57	49	38	12	161	59	32	76
1	22	19	82	25	59	22	5	12
2	15	13	88	27	24	9	1	3
3	14	12	81	25	13	5	3	7
4 and over	8	7	36	11	15	5	1	2
Total	116	100	325	100	272	100	42	100

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 46.--Education and residence of nondisabled household heads in household size-income classes 1 and 2 by age and sex of heads, 1966

Item	Nondisabled heads in household size-income classes 1 and 2 1/					
	Males, under 45		Males, 45-64		Females, under 65	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Educational level						
0-4 years	2	5	4	10	3	17
5-7	7	18	16	40	4	22
8	11	28	13	33	5	28
9 and over	19	49	7	17	6	33
Total	39	100	40	100	18	100
Residence						
Farm	8	21	23	58	3	17
Nonfarm	31	79	17	42	15	83
Total	39	100	40	100	18	100

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 47.--Education and residence of nondisabled household heads in household size-income classes 3-6 by age and sex of heads, 1966

Item	Nondisabled heads in household size-income classes 3-6 1/					
	Males, under 45		Males, 45-64		Females, under 65	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Educational level						
0-4 years	7	2	19	7	2	5
5-7	24	7	34	12	6	14
8	49	15	89	33	11	26
9 and over	245	76	130	48	23	55
Total	325	100	272	100	42	100
Residence						
Farm	56	17	91	33	2	5
Nonfarm	269	83	181	67	40	95
Total	325	100	272	100	42	100

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.

Table 48.--Number and percentage of nondisabled household heads in household size-income classes 1 and 2, by willingness to accept free training or education, to change jobs, and by age and sex, 1966

Item	Nondisabled household heads in household size-income classes 1 and 2 1/					
	Males, under 45		Males, 45-64		Females, under 65	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Willing to accept free training or education to improve job situation						
Yes	28	76	14	74	11	65
No	9	24	5	26	6	35
Not asked	(2)	--	(21)	--	(1)	--
Total	37	100	19	100	17	100
Willing to change to another type of job at higher pay if able to live in present community						
Yes	29	74	16	84	7	41
No	10	26	3	16	10	59
Not asked	(0)	--	(21)	--	(1)	--
Total	39	100	19	100	17	100
If "no," reason is						
Satisfied with present job situation	10	100	2	67	3	30
Seniority or fringe benefits	0	0	1	33	0	0
Other 2/	0	0	0	0	7	70
Total	10	100	3	100	10	100

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.
2/ Other reasons are, for example, property ownership and age.

Table 49.--Number and percentage of nondisabled household heads in household size-income classes 3-6, by willingness to accept free training or education, to change jobs, and by age and sex, 1966

Item	Nondisabled household heads in household size-income classes 3-6 1/					
	Males, under 45		Males, 45-64		Females, under 65	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Willing to accept free training or education to improve job situation						
Yes	233	72	89	50	12	63
No	92	28	88	50	7	37
Not asked	(0)	--	(95)	--	(23)	--
Total	325	100	177	100	19	100
Willing to change to another type of job at higher pay if able to live in present community						
Yes	209	65	95	54	9	50
No	115	35	82	46	9	50
Not asked	(1)	--	(95)	--	(24)	--
Total	324	100	177	100	18	100
If "no," reason is						
Satisfied with present job situation	85	74	46	56	6	67
Seniority or fringe benefits	12	10	13	16	0	0
Physical reasons	0	0	6	7	1	11
Other 2/	18	16	17	21	2	22
Total	115	100	82	100	9	100

1/ See table 10 for initial presentation of household size-income classes.
2/ Other reasons are, for example, property ownership and age.

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1970—394-381/ERS-80